DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 161 SP 031 252

AUTHOR Bennett, Christine; And Others
TITLE Preservice Multicultural Teacher Education: Predictors of Student Readiness.
PUB DATE 29 Mar 89
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; *Cognitive Development; *Cognitive Structures; Cultural Differences; Ethnicity; Higher Education; *Multicultural Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Social Bias; *Student Attitudes; Teacher Education Curriculum

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the latest in a series of studies on the impact of a multicultural education course for preservice teachers. The course is based on a conceptual model of multicultural teacher education that includes four interactive goals: (1) to develop multiple historical perspectives and cultural consciousness; (2) to develop intercultural competence; (3) to combat racism, prejudice, and discrimination; and (4) to develop multicultural teaching skills. Previous research on the course had established that overall, the course had a positive impact on students' knowledge, attitudes and behaviors, but it also revealed that students enrolled in the course differed dramatically in their readiness and receptivity for multicultural education. While many students appeared to feel positive and receptive to the course content and experience, others seemed to be highly resistant. Since cognitive structures can affect ways students receive and process course information aimed at building multicultural knowledge and understanding, a measure of cognitive development was added to the study, and possible relationships between preservice teachers' cognitive development level and the impact of the course were explored. Twenty-six references and 10 tables are attached. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308161

Preservice Multicultural Teacher Education: Predictors of Student Readiness

by

Christine Bennett

Indiana University

Timothy Niggle

Indiana University

Frances Stage

Indiana University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Bennett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, March 29, 1989.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

This paper reports the latest in a series of studies on the impact of a multicultural education course (M300) for preservice teachers. The M300 course is based on a conceptual model of multicultural teacher education that includes four interactive goals: 1) to develop multiple historical perspectives and cultural consciousness, 2) to develop intercultural competence, 3) to combat racism, prejudice and discrimination, and 4) to develop multicultural teaching skills. (Bennett, 1988) (See Figure One)

Previous research on M300 had established that overall, the course has a positive impact on students' knowledge, attitudes and behaviors (Bennett, Okinaka and Wu, 1988), but it also revealed that students enrolled in the course differed dramatically in their readiness and receptivity for multicultural education. While many students appear to feel positive and receptive to the course content and experiences, others seem to be highly resistant.

During the Spring semester of 1981, McGeehan (1982) conducted a qualitative research study of learning readiness for multicultural education among a sample of 38 students enrolled in two sections of M300. She examined each student's level of multicultural knowledge, sense of ethnic identity, feelings of social distance, and history of interracial contact experiences at the beginning and end of the course. More extensive case studies were conducted with 13 students, 5 of whom had emerged as "resisters". The case studies included extensive interviewing, analysis of student journals and analysis of autobiographical essays.

Among her conclusions were the following:

1. Students who expressed positive attitudes and feelings toward M300 tended to be female, to have had frequent, high quality previous inter-ethnic experience, and to have engaged in positive inter ethnic behaviors.
2. Those students who expressed more accepting attitudes and feelings toward other ethnic groups at the beginning of the course tended to make the greatest gains in multicultural knowledge by the end of the course.
3. Students who displayed the greatest amount of attitude and knowledge change were those with the most room for change, (that is, they did not already possess qualities emphasized in M300), and those with the most positive initial attitude toward the course. (There was a ceiling effect among students who were most knowledgeable and most open at the beginning of M300 that suggests the course may have been too introductory or superficial for them.)
4. Male participants who were less positive toward the course displayed greater ethnocentrism than their more positive male peers.
5. Individuals who were generally negative toward M300 came from lower middle or lower socioeconomic groups, felt defensive regarding material presented, and believed whites are often subject to reverse discrimination.
6. Individuals expressing mixed or negative reactions to the course recalled hearing family members make stereotypic, prejudiced statements about other ethnic group persons, they complained that the course

required too much work, and said it was difficult to relate course material to their chosen field in education.

Although McGeehan's study did not attempt to measure or document an individual student's resistance to change, she suggested that this might be an important factor to consider in future research. She concluded that student readiness for multicultural education is based on more than the characteristics she had considered (ie. interethnic contact experiences, multicultural knowledge, sense of ethnic identity, and feelings of social distance), and suggested that "knowledge of the student's characteristic response to any learning opportunity" such as need for structure and tolerance of ambiguity might be important (McGeehan, 1982, p. 169).

A follow-up study on the entire group of students enrolled in six sections of M300 during the fall of 1986 confirmed many of the conclusions reached by McGeehan's case study approach (Bennett, Okinaka and Wu, 1988). Both significant knowledge gains and attitude changes were noted at the end of the 16 week course, and these were largely maintained a year later. Students who expressed less social distance and more openness to cultural diversity at the beginning of the course made the greatest gains in multicultural knowledge and in more specific measures of openness. Conversely, students who expressed the most social distance at the beginning of the course scored the highest number of incorrect answers on the posttest. Since students were encouraged to leave items blank if they were unsure of the answer and did not loose points for unanswered items, incorrect answers may indicate strongly held misconceptions.

These previous findings that the most open-minded students tend to be most receptive to M300 as shown by greater gains in openness to cultural

diversity and multicultural knowledge, suggested that we are most effective with those students who are already convinced, but do little to reach the others. It appears that different course experiences might be needed, experiences matched to the individual's level of readiness for multicultural education. In order to accomplish this, deeper insight is needed into the nature of the "resistance". Our previous attitudinal measures of openness to cultural diversity, sense of ethnic identity, and interracial contact experiences did not provide information about cognitive structures. Such cognitive structures could affect ways students receive and process course information aimed at building multicultural knowledge and understanding. Therefore, in the present study, we added a measure of cognitive development, (Perry, 1970) and explored possible relationships between preservice teachers' cognitive development level and the impact of M300.

Theoretical Framework

Perry (1970) developed a theory describing college students' intellectual development. He outlined a three level scheme which traced students' evolution in thinking about the nature of knowledge, truth, values, and responsibilities. Within each level were positions which further differentiated between levels of development.

At the lowest levels of development, dualism, the individual views the world in absolute terms. Students at this level of development see things in black and white and tend to look to authorities for the "correct" answer. Uncertainty is viewed as an error on the part of an "illegitimate authority" or as a temporary condition which will be "corrected" once experts determine the correct answers.

At the next level of development, relativism, the individual views the world in contextual terms. Students at this level see many possible perspectives, and thus, many possible answers to the same question. At the earlier stages of this level, students have difficulty choosing and defending a single perspective on an issue and also question the legitimacy of doing so. Toward the end of movement through this level a student can apply criteria within contexts to begin to make judgments about issues.

At the highest level of development, commitment, the individual is ready to use criteria to evaluate issues and to actually take a stand. Students at this level begin to clarify their values and to make and live their commitments.

Baxter-Magolda and Porterfield (1985) provide examples of students' thinking at the dualistic level. If asked about the role of the instructor in the classroom a dualistic student might respond that the instructor's role is to provide and clarify information. The role of peers in the classroom is simply to ask questions and to make learning more interesting and relaxed. Students at the dualistic level need more structure in the classroom and have difficulty thinking in abstract terms.

Students at the relativistic level of development view the role of the instructor as providing guidance to students as they consider and evaluate alternative perspectives. Peers share their diverse perspectives and learn to think independently. Students at this level are more comfortable in a less structured classroom atmosphere.

As students move into the early levels of commitment they begin to view the role of the instructor as a guide in the considered evaluation and

choice of perspectives. Other students provide challenge as well as support as students begin to clarify their commitments and live up to their values.

Perry's theory of cognitive development has been widely measured and tested. Instruments have been developed and validated which clearly demonstrate students' growth according to Perry's scheme (Knefelkamp, 1974; Widick, 1975). In addition, researchers have successfully conducted experiments in the college setting which foster apparently development along the Perry scale (Clinchy & Zimmerman, 1975; Ryan, 1984; Widick & Simpson, 1978).

Most assessments of students' intellectual development use either extensive interviewing or paragraph completion (Allen, 1983; Knefelkamp, 1974; Widick, 1975; Taylor, 1983). These methods have been subject to criticism. Paragraph completion methods require extensive training for the assessor and are time consuming to administer (Stonewater, Stonewater & Hadley, 1986).

Erwin (1983) developed an assessment instrument that could be more easily administered and scored by practitioners than paragraph completion methods. The Scale of Intellectual Development (SID) measures students in four areas: dualism, relativism, commitment, and empathy.

Stonewater, Stonewater, and Hadley (1986) compared the SID and the Allen paragraph completion instrument. They demonstrated that the Allen instrument and the SID only correlated on one level. They concluded that the dualism scale of the SID was most useful for discriminating between students at various levels of intellectual development.

Research Questions

The following research questions were explored in the study:

1. Do students in preservice multicultural education programs exhibit a range of cognitive development levels?
2. Is there a relationship between cognitive development level and a student's multicultural knowledge at the time of course entry?
3. Is there a relationship between cognitive development level and a student's social distance at the time of course entry?
4. Is there a relationship between cognitive development level and multicultural knowledge gains by the end of M300?
5. Is there a relationship between cognitive development level and feelings of social distance by the end of M300?
6. Does the overall reduction in feelings of social distance toward various ethnic groups transfer to other groups based on religion?

METHODOLOGY

Respondents

Students enrolled in the M300 course, "Teaching in a Pluralistic Society," during the spring semester of 1988 were the respondents for the study. Approximately 178 students from six different course sections participated: The sections were taught by four different instructors who worked as a team to coordinate M300. The course is based on a conceptual model of multicultural teacher education that has been described elsewhere (Bennett, et. al., 1988). Paper and pencil questionnaires were administered to the respondents at the beginning and end of the semester. Most of the students had enrolled in the class as a prerequisite for teacher

certification in Secondary, Middle School, and All Grades (Art, Music, or Physical Education) programs. One hundred and sixty two students completed both the pre and posttests; 62% of them were female, 88% were white; 44% were Protestant, 27% were Catholic; and 18% reported no religious affiliation; and the majority were undergraduates in their late teens or early twenties. Nine teaching content areas were represented, 17% in science, 14% in social studies, 12% in fine arts, 11% in English, 10% in physical education, 9% in math and 6% in foreign language.

Design of the Study

A quasi-experimental design of pretest, treatment, and posttest was employed for this study. The pretest phase of the study was completed in the second week of January 1988 during the first week of the spring semester. A measurement of each respondent's intellectual and ethical developmental stage was made using the Scale of Intellectual Development, based on Perry's scheme and developed by Erwin (1983). Each student was also tested for basic factual information concerning multicultural issues using the true-false test used in previous M300 research. An estimate of each student's feelings of social distance toward different racial and ethnic groups was developed from scores on a modified Social Distance Scale, originally developed by E. Bogardus in 1925.

The treatment phase of the research project consisted of the regular sixteen week progression, January through April, of M300: Teaching in a Pluralistic Society. Posttests containing the multicultural knowledge test and social distance scale were administered by individual instructors at the end of the semester.

During the final phase of the data collection process interviews were conducted with approximately ten percent of the participants. Interviewees were selected from those respondents whose scores fell in the most extreme ends of the dualism scale. The interviews were conducted in February and March 1988 to determine if any distinguishing characteristics could be identified between students labeled high or low on dualism, particularly concerning the impact of M300.

Instruments

The questionnaire was composed of a set of demographic identifiers; the Scale of Intellectual Development (SID), a measure of intellectual and ethical development; a modified version of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale; and an objective test for multicultural knowledge.

The Scale of Intellectual Development (SID) by Erwin was developed in 1981 as an objectively scored instrument to measure the W. Perry intellectual and ethical development scheme. The original instrument has 101 items with a four point, forced choice answer key, including from (1) strongly agree, (2) slightly agree, (3) slightly disagree, (4) strongly disagree. Results may be categorized into scores on four character scales; dualism, relativism, commitment, and empathy. The SID was used as a pretest measure of cognitive development level.

Based on the review of the literature, the researchers decided to use the Perry level scale which was determined to be the most valid in previous studies (Stage, 1988; Stonewater, Stonewater, & Hadley, 1986). The 39 items from the dualism scale were used to compute a mean score indicating the degree to which a student agreed or disagreed with dualistic statements. Sample items included:

"There is nothing more annoying than a question that can have more than one answer."

"I am free to believe whatever I want only when the experts do not agree."

"I would learn more in the humanities if teachers would stick to the facts."

Students whose scores were at least 1 standard deviation below the mean for the group were classified as low dualists. In other words, they disagreed most strongly with the dualistic items on the SID. Students whose scores were at least one standard deviation above the mean for the group were classified as high dualists. These students most strongly agreed with the dualistic items from the SID. Those who fell within one standard deviation of the mean were classified as medium dualists.

A modified version of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale was again used to measure M300 students' acceptance of diverse ethnic and racial groups. Originally designed by Emory S. Borgardus in 1922 as a measure of the "amount of understanding and intimacy which characterizes personal and social relations" (Owen, Eisnor, McFaul, 1981), the Bogardus Social Distance Scale has a long history of research. Respondents from colleges and universities throughout the US were asked to report their level of willingness to associate with thirty different ethnic or racial groups. The original categories of responses included "would marry," "would have as regular friends," "would work beside in an office," "would have several families in my neighborhood," "would have merely as speaking acquaintances," "would have live outside my neighborhood," "would have live outside my community."

For the purpose of M300: Teaching in a Pluralistic Society, a revised Bogardus instrument was developed. Minor changes were made in the response categories. "I would teach or supervise" was substituted for "I would work with."

In the latest study of M300 students, more substantial changes were made in the categories of people or groups that students were asked to respond to on the instrument. Changes in the original ethnic and racial groups include the deletion of Americans, Armenians, Hollanders, Japanese-Americans, Mexican-Americans, Norwegians, Pyrevarians, Scots, and Swedes. Those groups were dropped because more contemporarily descriptive groups were added, because all hyphenated groups were eliminated, and/or because the group was not a real ethnic or racial category. Added to the RACE, COLOR, AND NATION OR ORIGIN list were Appalachians, Australians, Brazilians, Costa Ricans, Cubans, Eskimo-Inuit, Hatians, Iranians, Israeli, Jamaicans, Lebanese, Malaysians, Nicaraguans, Peruvians, Polynesians, Puerto Ricans, Rural Blacks, Rural Whites, Russians, Saudi Arabians, Sudanese, Ugandans, Urban Blacks, Urban Whites, and Vietnamese. In addition, five other categories of population were added to the instrument. RELIGION, including atheist, agnostic, Born Again, Budhist, Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Jewish-conservative, Jewish-Orthodox, Jewish-Reformed, Mormon, Moslem, nature worship and Protestant were added. Also added was POLITICAL CREED, including Anarchists, Communists, Democrats, Independents, Ku Klux Klan, Nazi Facist, Republicans and Socialists. Groups with permanent or temporary HANDICAP OR MEDICAL CONDITIONS, including amputation, blindness, chronic illness, deafness, disfiguration, emotional illness, mentally retardation, obesity, pregnancy, speech impairment, terminal illness, or wheel chair

confinement were enumerated. The AGE factor of the population was included in categories ranging from birth to 5, 6-12, 13-17, 18-35, 36-60, 60+. Finally SEX AND SEXUAL PREFERENCE was included as a defining characteristic of the population in terms of females, lesbians, males, and homosexuals.

In all cases the additions and deletions were made with contemporary world events as the reference. Contemporary events surrounding the Middle East and Latin America justified more references to groups from those areas. The addition of other categories reflected constitutionally "protected classes" of people that teachers are required to deal with professionally. The only exception to that rule is the issue of sexual preference, it is not currently identified as a protected classification. However, substantial amounts of case law in the area suggest that it is likely to be the next demographic classification to be protected by the courts.

An information specific or multicultural knowledge test was also included. The true-false objective test was developed in 1985 and revised in 1986 as a pretest and posttest summative evaluation tool for M300. The test has 30 items focusing on factual information about the diverse ethnic groups studied in the course, multicultural terminology, history of the USA, and related civil rights issues. The test is based on a text used by students in all six sections of the M300 course included.

Among the terms included on the objective test were: cultural pluralism, ethnic group, minority group, race, and institutional racism. The test included historical and current events issues related to the separate but equal doctrine; civil rights advocacy; formation of reform Judaism; immigration patterns, quotas and exclusion policies; the relationship between origins and socioeconomic status of Blacks; treaty

guarantees; territorial possessions of the USA; the Indian Removal Act; textbook selection policies and geography. Some basic demographic facts concerning life expectancy of native Americans; percentage and ethnic/racial makeup of the population in the USA and related data was included. Finally, issues concerning learning styles, learning strategies, and teaching styles were featured on the general knowledge test.

Over the last four years, the average corrected score on the pretest has been 7-8/30. The average corrected score on the posttest has been 22-23/30. The three-fold increase in scores has been generally regarded as a positive indication of course effectiveness.

FINDINGS

The overall results of this research confirmed previous findings on the impact of M300 on student attitudes and multicultural knowledge. Significant gains in multicultural knowledge and reductions in social distance were noted on the posttest in all six sections of M300. These findings are reported elsewhere (Niggle, 1989). This paper will report only of the findings related to students' levels of dualism and the new areas of social distance.

I. Levels of Cognitive Development Among M300 Students

By design, approximately 16% of the students fell into the least dualistic category, and 18% fell into the most dualistic category. The remaining 66% of the M300 students were categorized in the moderately dualistic group.

Sex by Dualism Levels

There was significant difference .0089 between male and female respondents in terms of dualism levels. The cohort had twenty-six (16%) students classified in the least dualistic group. Females (20.6%) were nearly two and one half times more likely to be classified in the least dualistic category than males (8.3%). One hundred and seven (66%) of the students fell into the moderately dualistic range, males (63.3%) and females (67.6%) were represented in this group at nearly equivalent percentages levels. In a reverse of the order found in the least dualistic category, males (28.3%) were nearly two and one half times more likely than females (11.8%) to be classified as most dualistic.

Age by Dualism Levels

There was no significant difference (.5090) between age categories and the distribution of dualism levels.

Disability Levels by Dualism Levels

There was no significant difference (.7191) between disability levels and the distribution of dualism levels.

Religion by Dualism Levels

There was no significant difference (.4730) between religious group identification and distribution of dualism levels.

Class Section Taken by Dualism Levels

There was no significant difference (.0772) between the section of the course (and instructor) and the student's dualism level.

Class Rank by Dualism Level

Dualism level of students' at different class ranks was significantly different (.0492). The small number of students (one) at the Freshman level

may have complicated the statistical count. Nonetheless, it should be noted that at the least dualistic level, the Sophomores (14.3), Juniors (7.5%), and Seniors (11.8%) were significantly below the average (16%) and the Graduate Students (39.3%) were overrepresented by nearly two and one half times the expected number. The Freshman (100%), Sophomores (69.8%), and Juniors (71.7%) were above the average (66%) for the moderately dualistic group. The Seniors (64.7%) were slightly above the average. The Graduate Students (46.4%) were significantly under the average. The range of distributions among the most dualistic group was relatively limited at 9.2. The Sophomores (15.9%) and Graduate Students (14.3%) reported numbers under the average (17.9%). The Juniors (20.8%) and Seniors (23.5%) had slightly higher than average numbers in this group.

Expected Teaching Area by Dualism Level

Students varied significantly (.0050) in their dualism level when analyzed in terms of their expected teaching areas. Students from English (33.3) were three times as likely to be in the least dualistic group as Social Studies (8.7%) and Other-Combination Majors (9.7%). The English students were twice as likely to fit into the least dualistic group as Science (14.8) majors. Prospective Fine Arts (20%), Foreign Language (20%) and Math (21.4%) teachers were slightly overrepresented in the least dualistic category.

The moderately dualistic category (66%) had an overrepresentation of Science (77.8%), Social Studies (78.3%), and Other-Combination (80.6%) majors. The English (55.6%), Fine Arts (45%), Language (50%), Math (64.3%) and Physical Education (56.3%) are slightly underrepresented in the

category. Home Economics (0.0%) was not represented because of the number of students.

The most dualistic category (17.9%) has a large group of Physical Education (43.8%), Fine Arts (35%) and Language (30%) majors. The Math (14.3%), Social Studies (13%), English (11.1%), Other-Combination (9.7%) and Science (7.4%) preservice teachers had fewer than expected representatives in this category.

II. Relationships Between Cognitive Development Level and Multicultural Knowledge

Scores on the multicultural knowledge pre and posttests were examined in terms of the number of correct items, the number of incorrect items, the number of blank items, and the adjusted score (the number correct minus the number incorrect). Least dualistic students scored highest on all of these measures except "number wrong" (where they scored lowest), followed next by moderately dualistic students. Most dualistic students scored lowest on all the measures, except "number wrong", where they scored highest (see Tables 1-4). These differences on the pretests were significant for "number wrong" and the adjusted score, but not for the "number right" or number of blanks. None of the differences are statistically significant on the posttest.

Based on these findings, it appears that least dualistic students have the strongest multicultural knowledge base both when they enter M300 and when they leave the course. Most dualistic students reveal the lowest knowledge base at both points in time, but they make the largest gains in number of correct items on the posttest. Most dualistic students also maintain the highest number of incorrect responses on the posttest.

The fact that differences by dualism level on the posttest knowledge measures are not significant, suggests that M300 has a similar impact on the development of multicultural knowledge gains among students at all three levels. Both the number right and number wrong increase for each group. Since least dualistic students tend to be more comfortable challenging authority, they may be resistant to some of the perspectives presented in M300 and thus disagree with items judged to be false, such as: "A person's race helps determine the individual's attitudes and behaviors." Why misconceptions would increase during the course is puzzling, and will be explored through an item analysis of incorrect items on the pre and posttests.

Also puzzling is the fact that knowledge gains as measured by the adjusted score are much lower than they have been in previously studies of M300. While the pretest means are close (9.56 in 1986 and 8.19 in the present study) the posttest scores were 19.16 for adjusted knowledge score, 23.24 for number right and 4.34 for number wrong in 1986, compared to 12.47 (adjusted score), 14.71 (number right) and 6.52 (number wrong) in 1988. One possible explanation for this is that in the past two years the M300 course has moved closer to a conceptual framework of multicultural teacher education, and focuses less on fact acquisitions aimed at developing ethnic literacy. The multicultural knowledge test is less closely matched with course content than in the past, and needs to be revised if it is to be used as an indicator of knowledge gains resulting from M300. The conceptual model that provides the current framework for M300 stresses the development of openness to cultural diversity, respect for human dignity, and the development of cultural consciousness and multiple perspectives. Therefore,

the attitudinal measures used in this study may provide a truer indication of course impact than the multicultural knowledge test.

III. Relationships Between Cognitive Development Level and Feelings of Social Distance

A consistent significant pattern emerges on both the pre and posttests showing that least dualistic students express the least social distance and most dualistic students express the most social distance toward groups based on the following characteristics: ethnicity/race, religion, political creed, handicap or medical conditions, age, and sex and sexual preference (see Table 5). Another pattern is that overall, M300 students are most open to groups based on ethnicity/race, religion, and handicap or medical conditions, and least open to groups based on political creed and sex/sexual preference. Social distance scores are lower on the posttest for each of the six characteristics as seen on both group means and dualism level means. However, these reductions are statistically significant only in the area of ethnicity/race (Niggle, 1989).

The reduction in social distance is striking among most dualistic students, particularly toward groups based on race/ethnicity, political creed, age and sex/sexual preference. Social distance among least dualistic students drops toward all groups except those based on ethnicity/race and sex/sexual preference, but there was little room for drop in the former. Moderately dualistic students show their largest drop in feelings of social distance toward groups based on ethnicity/race, religion, handicap/medical condition, and sex/sexual preference.

Apparently, M300 has the strongest impact on reducing social distance toward groups based on ethnicity/race and religion, but only among

moderately and most dualistic students. Since most and moderately dualistic students were less open than least dualistic students to ethnic diversity at the beginning of M300, these findings support the conclusions from previous research on M300 that there is a ceiling effect on attitude change among students who are most open to begin with. These findings also indicate that most and moderately dualistic students can benefit from a course such as M300, and that among least dualistic students a reduction in feelings of social distance may occur toward other groups not directly dealt with in the course if their pretest expressions of social distance toward the group was relatively high (ie. religion, age and political creed.)

In contrast to multicultural knowledge, where significant differences between least, moderately, and most dualistic students disappear on the posttest, significant differences by dualism remain on four of the six social distance categories on the posttest. The posttest differences are no longer significant for ethnicity/race or political creed. Significantly different degrees of social distance by dualism level remain for religion, handicap/medical condition, age and sex/sexual preference, even though the mean scores are closer. These differences may remain because of the reduced feelings of social distance toward these groups among low dualism students.

IV. Summary of Interview Results

Sixteen (9.87%) students were selected from the one-hundred and sixty-two respondents for interviews. The interview was designed to reassess the relative dualism levels for students originally placed in the extremes of the distribution. More specifically, were students identifiable by their dualism levels after one year? And if so, did they demonstrate any differences in their perceptions of M300 or its content?

The interviews were scheduled one year after the first assessment. All interviews were conducted over the telephone, without prior warning to the respondents. The interviews took place between February 26 and March 3, 1989. The interview sessions ran between thirty and forty-five minutes. Responses were recorded and read back to the student for verification; changes were made as requested. No one refused to be interviewed or express any objections to the questions.

A stratified sample, representing at least two students from each class section and one each from the high and low ends of the dualism distribution was randomly selected. Eight (three males and five females) students were selected for an interview were from the original twenty-six students identified as having low dualism levels. Eight (four males and four females) of the interview subjects were selected from the twenty-nine students classified having high dualism levels.

The questions included in the interview were based on Perry's (1970) original descriptions and related factors identified by J. Cornfield and L. Knefelkamp (1979). Those questions included items related to the role of the teacher, student, and peers in the educational process; the nature of knowing; and conditions that support or challenge learning.

In addition, items related to multicultural education and the course were included. Career plans; the interrelationship between teaching and learning; the differences between equality and equity; and recollections about M300 were solicited. A summary of the results is detailed below.

1. Are you still planning to become a teacher?

All but two of the respondents were still planning to teach. Both the most and the least dualistic groups had one person change career plans. The

least dualism group person decided to go to law school and the most dualism group person withdrew from school for personal reasons.

2. How would you describe a good teacher?

3. What is the role of the teacher in education?

The most dualistic group identified the role of a teacher in education as a "model," "passing on knowledge," and "guidance." This is consistent with the "dualistic" perception of teaching as content transformation. Typical of the types of comments from this group were:

"To transfer knowledge and skills to students in his area."

"A role model at times; someone students respect; sometimes a high priced babysitter."

This group went on to assert that a good teacher was someone who "knows their subject," "has the respect of the class," "makes class interesting," "someone who cares," and "able to relate to the students." The importance of the teacher as an authority is reflected in these responses. For example, this group suggested that the teachers was:

"Someone able to relate to the students, make class interesting; someone who knows their subject."

"A person who gives extra time to help the students, student oriented instead of task oriented; and takes time to fix problems."

The least dualistic group observed that the role of the teacher in the educational process included being a "facilitator," "friend," "to motivate," and "promote the value of learning." The process of teaching is more important to this group:

"Motivator and guide to the learning process, more than just giving information, more access to facilitator."

"To value education for its own sake, as opposed to a job skill; give an opportunity to receive or perceive an education. To promote the value of learning."

When asked to describe a good teacher, the least dualistic students identified factors like "knowledgeable," "caring," "inspirational," "challenging," "student oriented," and "creative." Again it is the interactive process of teaching that is key:

"One that is energetic about their subject matter; pays attention to the learning styles of their students; and finds methods for challenging students."

"Interested in their teaching area; care about their students academically and personally."

4. What is the role of the student in education?

The most dualistic students suggest that the role of the student is to "learn," "cooperate," "behave," "be prepared," and "be open." Students at this level perceive learning as passive information accumulation. The typical response from this group:

"To receive information."

"Prepared for class, whether interested in the subject matter or not."

The least dualistic group were are more inclined to perceive the role of the student as an activity, to "become part of the learning process," "try and comprehend," and as "learner and teacher."

"Students must also care; work at learning; motivate themselves; and follow through with studying and thinking."

"To get out as quickly as possible and actively participate in the learning process."

5. What is the role of peers in the learning process?

The least dualistic group were also more likely to identify peers as "valuable," support(ive)," and "important" parts of the learning process. This reaffirms the importance of different points of view. Typically, this group reported:

> "They are extremely important, probably more effective than the teacher in some circumstances, and sometimes they can be directed by the teacher."
>
> "To be supportive of students who want to learn and the teacher."

The most dualistic students identified peers as both good and bad. They observed that peers were "advantage/disadvantage," "influential," and "supportive." The role of peers is a partnership than an embellishment. More specifically they note:

> "Significant, peers affect what is and how much is learned."
>
> "Depending on the group, they can be positive or negative. Competition is positive and peer pressure is negative."

6. Can there be learning without teaching?

7. Can there be teaching without learning?

All of the students, but one (most dualistic) correctly determined that there could be learning without teaching. Likewise, only one student (least dualistic) philosophically observed that there was no teaching without learning. It should be noted that students in both groups expressed a lack of confidence in their response to this question.

8. What does it mean to "know" something?

When asked about the nature of "knowing something," the least dualistic students suggested that it meant to "grasp," or "apply" the concept to daily affairs. The interactive nature of knowledge is affirmed. As observed:

"Conscious or unconscious assessibility to it."

"There are many levels of knowing something, but there is no magical level; you know about it, but not absolute."

The most dualistic respondents reported that knowing something was to "understand," "apply," and "be familiar." Knowledge is treated more like a commodity than a utility. Although it should be noted that application was still identified by this group as an important factor. They responded:

"A thorough understanding of terms and concepts so that you can explain them to someone so they understand it."

"To be able to show or demonstrate it."

9. What kinds of things facilitate learning for you?

Both groups reported that "interest," "hands-on activities," and "application" were important aspects facilitating their learning activities. However, the most dualistic group focused on the environment and how information is presented.

"The way it is presented to you; how much I liked the information; how strongly I identified with it; and its strong points."

"A quiet place-room; good relationship with the teacher, rapport where I can check my progress."

"I have to experience it."

The least dualistic group tended to comment on the processes of learning.

"Something that I find relevant or applicable. Research, synthesis, and reporting about something is interesting."

"Activities, discussions, and thought provoking stories or situations."

10. What kinds of things make it difficult for you to learn?

The least dualistic group reported that "dull textbooks," "unstructured lessons," and "memorization and reading" made it difficult to learn something. These answers were shared between all three dualism groups. This particular group was exemplified by the following statements:

"Being told how I should go about learning something."

"When it wasn't from experiences."

The most dualistic group commented on "lack of interest," "foreign or new things," "any distractions," and "confusion." These factors are consistent with the need for structure and environmental concerns associated with this group. They noted:

"Material presented too fast or difficult subjects and noise."

"If the teacher just tells me about it and then I am expected to show what is being talked about."

11. What does it mean to treat people equally?

12. Is that always fair?

Absolute mathematical equality and the concept of equity were the object of these items. Only three (two least and one most dualistic) students were unable to distinguish between the concepts of equality and equity. The remaining thirteen students were aware of the difference. This was a multicultural content item. Typical responses included:

"Equality is "they all get the same treatment."

"To have unbiased and unjudgemental attitudes."

"Equity is "...everyone is treated humanely."

"Sometimes a student will need more attention than others."

13. Who is responsible for insuring that people are treated fairly?

The least dualistic group identified "everyone," "teachers," and the legislature" as the authorities responsible for insuring that everyone be treated fairly. This group was characteristically consistent in identifying their personal responsibility for taking action. They noted:

"Everyone is responsible by insisting on the ideal."

"Everybody, parents, administrators, teachers, and the general public must insure that discrimination does not occur."

The most dualistic respondents reported that "teachers," "administrators," and the "person themselves" are responsible. This group was most likely to identify an authority person (not themselves) as responsible for taking acting. They observed:

"It is completely an individual relationship; whoever is in authority is responsible."

"It has to start with the administration, then it flows down channels."

14. What do you remember best about M300?

Finally, what was remembered about M300 was highly variable for both groups. The respondents identified "the instructor," "the concepts of the course," "personal growth," "group projects," "roots project," "values examination," "application to practical problems," "videos," "discussions of issues," "Bafa-Bafa," "field trip," and "ethnographies." In addition, the most dualistic group mentioned a "surprise over other students lack of

awareness over issues like Hiroshima," "support from other group members," and "creative opportunities."

The interview data supports the original classifications of the respondents into low and high dualism levels. The persistence of those intellectual characteristics are generally documented in the students' responses to specified questions. The respondents show some blending of characteristics, but there has been little movement between the two classifications by the respondents in the interviewing year.

V. Implications for Preservice Multicultural Teacher Education

Multicultural education is a democratic approach to teaching and learning that seeks to foster cultural pluralism within culturally diverse societies and an interdependent world. It consists of four distinct but overlapping dimensions that can help provide guidelines for multicultural teacher education: 1) the movement toward educational equity, 2) the curriculum approach that integrates multicultural and global perspectives into the traditional (primarily monoethnic) curriculum, 3) the process of becoming multicultural, and 4) the commitment to combat racism, prejudice and discrimination (Bennett, in press).

Courses in multicultural teacher education, therefore, deal with complex interdisciplinary concepts, controversial issues, self awareness, and positive attitude development. It is likely that the most dualistic students will have a difficult time in such courses, unless care is taken to "match" their levels of cognitive and ethical development. The most dualistic students tend to see the world in terms of "black or white" (either-or), while the least dualistic students take on a "live and let

live" attitude. The challenge for teacher educators is to design a course that meets the developmental needs of students all along the continuum of low to high dualism, realizing that incremental changes in attitudes and behavior may be the best one can expect among the most dualistic students.

Knefelkamp and others have developed a process model of instruction that is based on an analysis of student learning characteristics (Knefelkamp, 1981). The model, "Developmental Instruction," is based on William G. Perry Jr's model of Ethical Development in the College Years. Knefelkamp's model identifies four areas of "challenge and support" that provide guidelines for instruction, and that seem especially useful in the controversial and relatively ambiguous area of multicultural education. These areas of challenge and support represent four ways of varying instruction according to

1. The degree of structure in the learning environment or the amount of framework and direction provided to students,
2. The degree of diversity in the learning tasks (both qualitatively and quantitatively) including levels of difficulty, modalities and variety in instruction,
3. The type of experiential learning, ranging from concrete to vicarious, and
4. The amount of personalism in the learning environment.

The most dualistic students feel challenged by diversity have a high need for structure, benefit most from concrete learning experiences, and prefer a personalized environment, characterized by "discussions, assignments that help students make connections, availability of the instructor, comprehensive feedback, non-punishing environment,...objectivity and

enthusiasm for learning and for the subject matter (Knefelkamp, p. 5)." Students who are least dualist tend to fall at the opposite end of the continuum for each variable. They feel supported rather than challenged by diversity, can provide their own structure, learn well in vicarious learning environments (although they can also benefit from concrete learning experiences) and feel comfortable with moderate degrees of personalism.

Given that college students differ in their levels of dualism as well as in their knowledge base and attitudes, Knefelkamp's model of Developmental Instruction provides guidelines for multicultural education courses that serve heterogeneous groups of students. The concept of sequencing is central to the course design, so that "the course may begin in a "match" that is more supportive than challenging, and deliberately shift to a more challenging mode (Knefelkamp, p. 3)." The following examples, most from the M300 course, help to illustrate how the four variables in Knefelkamp's model can provide guidelines for preservice multicultural teacher education.

I. Structure---amount of framework and direction provided students
   a. Provide a context for the course; present the goals and rationale for multicultural education.
   b. Provide a model for multicultural curriculum development (e.g. Bennett, 1989).
   c. Clarify basic terminology in the field of multicultural education.
   d. Provide clear written instructions for course assignment, such as an ethnic roots autobiographical essay, book reviews, classroom observations, and international student interviews.

e. Provide opportunities for guided practice in the development and revisions of multicultural lesson plans.

f. Present key theories in the field of multicultural education that help inform classroom practice, for example social contact theory (Allport, 1954), cooperative team learning (Slavin, 1983) and effective group work (Cohen, 1986) and the theory of multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1983).

II. Diversity---the number of alternatives or perspectives which are encouraged or presented in the materials. Examples for multicultural education include:

a. The use of ethnic literature to develop insights into ethnic group perspectives as well as diversity within a group.

b. A variety of formats for course presentations and evaluation, including large and small group discussions, projects, field experiences, lectures, films and videos, panels, journals, attitudinal self inventories, etc.

c. Study of Banks' stages of ethnicity, including applications to self, characters in selected literature, and multicultural classrooms.

d. Research on one aspect of a selected ethnic group, expanding to two or more ethnic groups and two or more aspects of each group's experience.

e. Examination of numerous simple examples of human behavior and cognition to develop an understanding of E.T. Hall's theory of high versus low context culture (Hall, 1976).

III. Experiential Learning---the amount of involvement, directness and concreteness found in an activity. "Much of the concrete learning options can be done outside of class.....provided that students have sufficient guidelines and instructions and that the experiences be processed in the classroom. Case studies, role playing, exercises, interviewing projects, projects done in teams, design projects that have pragmatic use, data collection, assignments designed to have students record events and then reflect on them---all tend to facilitate the student's being able to make personal connections with the subject matter. (Knefelkamp, p. 4) Examples for multicultural education include

a. Interviews of international students, interviews of students, parents and teachers from various ethnic backgrounds.

b. Bafá Bafá: A Cross-cultural simulation (Shirts, 1977).

c. Cultural immersion experiences, such as those directed by James Mahan at Indiana University (e.g. Navajo Reservation, Rural Appalachia, and Inner city).

d. Research, development and revision of multicultural lesson plans, possibly in cooperative learning teams.

IV. Personalism---"the classroom as a community of scholars where it is safe to learn, where risk-taking is encouraged, where students learn rational dialogue, objective discussion, and where they learn to listen to one another and to evaluate ideas and concepts. It includes the amount of interaction in the classroom, the amount of legitimacy given to helping students make connections between the subject matter and

ways they are thinking about out-of-class issues. It does NOT include inappropriate self-disclosure." (Knefelkamp, p. 5)

Examples for multicultural education include:

a. Small group discussion of earliest and most recent memory of race,

b. Frank discussions of race relations and current events that reflect individual and institutional racism, prejudice, and discrimination,

c. School observations guided by Allport's four conditions of positive intergroup contact: 1) equal status environment, 2) reciprocal knowledge, 3) institutional support and 4) cooperative teamwork,

d. Examination of the university environment in terms of the goals of multicultural education, e.g. recruitment and retention of ethnic minority students, faculty and staff; multicultural and global perspectives in the curriculum, etc.,

e. Reports and discussion of international student interviews, showing perceptions and misconceptions of the U.S. macroculture held by members of various societies around the world,

f. Consideration of our failure to educate many ethnic minorities and the poor, (as seen in the statistics for school dropouts, suspensions and expulsions) at a time when the number of children-of-color is close to one third of the nation's school population,

g. Case studies and examples of individual students who experience cultural conflict in school, and who also illustrate the basic similarities among humans,

h. Sharing on the part of the instructor and students of personal experiences that help illuminate multicultural issues, learning environments, school community relationships, etc.,

i. Review and reports of research on topics such as teacher expectations, tracking, bilingual programs, cognition and learning styles associated with various ethnic groups, school discipline, cooperative team learning, and other effective school practices.

REFERENCES

Allen, R. (1983). Research on changes in intellectual development and critical thinking ability. (Grant No. SED 80-26487) Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation.

Allport, Gordon. The Nature of Prejudice. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass:, 1954.

Baxter-Magolda, M., & Porterfield, W.D. (1985). A new approach to assess intellectual development on the Perry scheme. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, 343-351.

Bennett, C. (1985). Comprehensive multicultural education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bennett, Christine. Comprehensive Multicultural Education: Theory and Practice. Second Edition. Allyn and Bacon. In Press.

Bennett, C., Okinaka, A. and Wu, Xiao-yang (1988, April). The effects of a multicultural education on preservice teachers' attitudes, knowledge, and behavior. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Bogardus, E. (1923). Social distance between catholics, jews, and protestants. Sociology and Social Research, 17,(2), 167-173.

Clinchy, B. & Zimmerman, C. (1975). Cognitive development in college. Unpublished manuscript.

Cohen, Elizabeth. Designing Groupwork: Strategies for Heterogeneous Classrooms. Columbia University Press, New York, 1986.

Erwin, T.D. (1983). The scale of intellectual development: Measuring Perry's scheme. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 6-12.

Gardner, Howard. Frames of Mind: A Theory of Multiple Intelligence. Basic Books, Inc, New York, 1983.

Hall, Edward T. "How Cultures Collide," Psychology Today. July 1978, pp. 69-75.

Knefelkamp, Lee. (1974). Developmental instruction: Fostering intellectual and personal growth of college students. Dissertation abstracts international, 36, 1271A.

Knefelkamp, Lee. "Developmental Instruction: Fostering Intellectual and Personal Development of College Students." Copyright, 1981. Available from the author.

McGeehan, R. (1982). The relationship of selected antecedents to outcomes of training in multicultural education for preservice teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Niggle, T.L. (1989). A study of the relationship between cognitive development level and meeting selected multicultural goals in preservice teacher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Owen, C., Eisner, H. and McFaul, T. (1981). A half century of social distance research: National replication of the Bogardus studies. Sociology and Social Research, 66, 81-98.

Perry, W.G. (1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Ryan, M.P. (1984). Monitoring text comprehension: Individual differences in epistemological standards. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 248-258.

Shirts, Gary R., Bafa, Bafa: A Cross Cultural Simulation. 1977. Published by Simile 11, 218 Twelfth Street, P.O. Box 910, Del Mar, Calif. 92014.

Slavin, Robert. Cooperative Learning. Longman, New York, 1983.

Stage, F.K. (1988). The development and test of a measure of Perry's theory of cognitive development, (unpublished manuscript).

Stonewater, B.B., Stonewater, J.K., & Hadley, T.D. (1986). Intelelctual development using the Perry scheme: An exploratory comparison of two instruments. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27, 542-547.

Taylor, M.B. (1983). The development of the masure of epistemological reflection. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 1065A.

Widick, C. (1975). An evaluation of developmental instruction in a university setting. Dissertation abstracts international, 36, 2041A.

Widick, C. & Simpson, D. (1978). Developmental concepts in college instruction. In C. Parker (Ed.) Encouraging development in college students. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Table One

Multicultural Knowledge by Dualism Level (# Correct)

	Pretest			Posttest		
	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
Least Dualistic	15.69	4.36	26	20.23	4.00	26
Moderately Dualistic	14.59	4.40	107	19.63	4.03	106
Most Dualistic	14.28	3.70	29	19.72	2.89	29
Group	14.71	4.28	162	19.76	3.85	161
F = .8773				F = .2533		
Sig. = .4179				NS = .7766		

Table Two

Multicultural Knowledge by Dualism Level (# Wrong)

	Pretest			Posttest		
	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
Least Dualistic	5.46	3.64	26	6.27	3.19	26
Moderately Dualistic	6.42	3.62	107	7.28	3.70	106
Most Dualistic	7.83	3.41	29	8.17	3.22	29
Group	6.52	3.59	162	7.28	3.54	162
F = 3.1016				F = 1.98		
Sig. = .0477				NS = .1414		

Table Three

Multicultural Knowledge by Dualism Level (Adjusted Score)

	Pretest			Posttest		
	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
Least Dualistic	10.23	4.32	26	13.96	5.46	26
Moderately Dualistic	8.17	4.76	107	12.35	6.39	106
Most Dualistic	6.45	4.77	29	11.55	4.84	29
Group	8.19	4.69	162	12.47	6.00	161
F = 4.4580				F = 1.164		
Sig. = .0131				NS = .3149		

Table Four

Multicutural Knowledge by Dualism Level (# Blank)

	Pretest			Posttest		
	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
Least Dualistic	8.85	6.77	26	3.54	4.82	26
Moderately Dualistic	9.07	6.43	107	3.08	4.36	106
Most Dualistic	7.93	5.32	29	2.52	4.14	29
Group	8.83	6.30	162	3.06	4.40	161
F = .3757				F = .3768		
Sig. = .6874				NS = .6866		

Table Five

Social Distance (Race/Ethnicity) by Dualism Level

	Pretest			Posttest		
	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
Least Dualistic	1.23	.33	26	1.27	.38	26
Moderately Dualistic	1.55	.55	107	1.44	.47	105
Most Dualistic	1.90	.99	27	1.55	.50	28
Group	1.56	.62	160	1.43	.46	159
F = 7.7322				F = 2.6330		
Sig. = .0006				Sig. = .0751		

Table Six

Social Distance (Religion) by Dualism Level

	Pretest			Posttest		
	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
Least Dualistic	1.53	.33	26	1.35	.29	26
Moderately Dualistic	1.69	.54	104	1.56	.44	105
Most Dualistic	2.00	.69	28	1.81	.66	28
Group	1.72	.54	158	1.57	.46	159
F = 5.5466				F = 6.7704		
Sig. = .0047				Sig. = .0015		

Table Seven

Social Distance (Political Creed) by Dualism Level

	Pretest			Posttest		
	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
Least Dualistic	2.10	.52	26	1.99	.62	26
Moderately Dualistic	2.24	.84	103	2.24	.81	105
Most Dualistic	2.64	.91	28	2.33	.82	28
Group	2.29	.81	157	2.21	.78	159
F = 3.5103				F = 1.4575		
Sig. = .0323				NS .236		

Table Eight

Social Distance (Handicap Medical Condition) by Dualism Level

	Pretest			Posttest		
	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
Least Dualistic	1.49	.29	26	1.46	.36	26
Moderately Dualistic	1.83	.50	103	1.73	.51	104
Most Dualistic	1.92	.54	27	1.78	.39	28
Group	1.79	.48	156	1.70	.47	158
F = 6.5006				F = 3.8430		
Sig. = .002				Sig. = .0235		

Table Nine

Social Distance (Age) by Dualism Level

	Pretest			Posttest		
	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
Least Dualistic	1.81	.22	25	1.65	.34	26
Moderately Dualistic	1.92	.29	102	1.91	.41	105
Most Dualistic	2.06	.58	27	1.89	.40	28
Group	1.93	.35	154	1.86	.40	159
F = 3.1088				F = 4.3859		
Sig. = .0475				Sig. = .0140		

Table Ten

Social Distance (Sex and Sexual Preference) by Dualism Level

	Pretest			Posttest		
	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
Least Dualistic	1.78	.29	26	1.77	.43	26
Moderately Dualistic	2.20	.78	102	2.11	.74	105
Most Dualistic	2.06	.58	27	1.89	.40	28
Group	2.17	.76	156	2.07	.69	159
F = 4.9885				F = 3.0166		
Sig. = .008				NS .0518		